

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-31 and 69-71 Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Walker further in view of XML

The Office at 3 states:

3. Claims 1-31 and 69-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,134,534; Walker et al. Conditional purchase offer management system for cruises, hereinafter referred to as Walker and further in view of Non-patent literature article "XML begins to impact 13213 e-commerce" Computer Economics Report, June 2000. Hereinafter referred to as XML.

Claims 1, and 22 Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Walker further in view of XML

The Office at 4 states:

4. As to claim 1 and 22 Walker teaches a system and method for Gathering production information from multiple establishments describing the product (C. 31. 19-26)
Removing the brand name (C. 71. 45-56)
Creating a database with only the core production information (Fig. 9a & 9b). However, Walker fails to teach XML being used for identifying the information. XML teaches using XML language with Oracle and Microsoft databases. (Pg. 2 para D and F). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine XML with the Oracle database used by Walker to simplify the gathering of products from various establishments. This simplification removes the requirement for all establishments to maintain their databases using a common language. This allows product information to be extracted from the establishments databases regardless of how it is maintained in the home databases.

(Emphases added.)

Applicants' claims 1 and 22 recite:

1. A computerized method of managing business data comprising:

gathering product information of at least one product from a plurality of establishments, the product information including a plurality of core traits from the at least one product described by the at least one establishment's brand-specific attributes;

defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside;

extracting the core traits from the at least one product's product information based on the XML schema defined;

removing the brand-specific attributes from the core traits; and
creating a user accessible database of XML instances of the schema, the XML instances including generic core product information from the core traits.

22. A computerized method of managing business information comprising:

gathering source specific information from at least one source;
extracting from the source specific product information a plurality of core traits of the source specific product information by applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema, wherein the at least one XML schema identifies the core traits of the source specific product information, removing any unrecognized parameters in the source specific product information, and structuring the core traits into categories;

creating a user accessible database including generic core product information from the core traits; and

disseminating the core traits by applying the at least one XML schema to a user template.

The Office states "However, Walker fails to teach XML being used for identifying the information. XML teaches using XML language with Oracle and Microsoft databases. (Pg. 2 para D and F)."

(Emphasis added.)

XML page 2 paragraph D states:

The other big effort is that of ①Microsoft's BizTalk architecture. BizTalk may also be an ace-in-the-hole for ①Microsoft to overcome its antitrust problems as well, because it serves to open Windows to competitors. BizTalk acts to integrate applications using XML standards applied to a message passing protocol. This protocol removes requirements for homogeneous databases. languages, network protocols, object models, and especially operating systems. Needless to say, BizTalk will play a key role in the Windows DNA 2000 architecture, and the BizTalk server will coordinate communications among B2B users in this structure.

(Emphases added.)

Applicants submit that the cited reference deals with a message passing protocol NOT with XML use in databases. In fact, as stated, this message passing protocol removes requirements for homogeneous databases.

Applicants submit that this message passing protocol does not disclose or suggest

Applicants' claimed elements of:

defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside;
extracting ... based on the XML schema defined;
creating a user accessible database of XML instances of the schema, the XML instances including ...
as claimed in Claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants submit that this message passing protocol does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed elements of:

extracting ...by applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema, wherein the at least one XML schema identifies ...;
disseminating the core traits by applying the at least one XML schema to a user template as claimed in Claim 22.

XML page 2 paragraph F states:

① Oracle, for example, has introduced its XML Developer's Kit, which is based on the company's Extensible Style Language and XML parser. These components will be provided in the upcoming version of the Oracelli application suite.
(Emphases added.)

Applicants submit that the cited reference deals with a XML Developer's Kit. The cited reference does NOT detail the use of XML in databases. A developer's kit does not

imply the use of XML in a database. For example, a XML developer's kit may be used to parse XML and then place the results in a hierarchical database. This does not mean that the database has XML instances of schema as Applicants have claimed.

Applicants submit that Walker and further in view of XML do not disclose limitations Applicants have claimed and therefore are non-obvious with respect to the cited references. Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of claims 1 and 22 and all claims dependent on these claims.

Claims 2, 7, and 27 - Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside" and Applicants' claim 22 limitation of "applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema" in further combination with Applicants' claims limitation of use by multiple establishments.

Claim 3 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside," in further combination with Applicants' claim limitation storing the core product information in the database.

Claim 4 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product

information to reside," in further combination with Applicants' claim limitation of providing access to the core product information regardless of the product information's origin.

Claims 5 and 23 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside," and Applicants' claim 22 limitation of "applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema" in further combination with Applicants' claims limitation wherein the core traits include at least one trait selected from physical characteristics, reliability specifications, durability ratings, availability status, price, shipping information, warranty coverage, consumer reviews and technical specifications..

Claim 6 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside," in further combination with Applicants' claim limitation wherein the core product information is displayable in a user template.

Claims 8-10, 12-13, 15, 24-26, and 28 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside," and Applicants' claim 22 limitation of "applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema" in further combination with Applicants' claims limitation of organizing the data base in several different ways.

Claims 11, 16, and 30 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside," and Applicants' claim 22 limitation of "applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema" in further combination with Applicants' claims limitation of categorizing core traits.

Claims 17 and 31 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside," and Applicants' claim 22 limitation of "applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema" in further combination with Applicants' claims limitation of placing the core product information in a user template.

Claim 18 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside," in further combination with Applicants' claim limitation of the schema are hierarchical identifying several different levels of detail of core attributes in each layer.

Claims 19 and 29 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside" or Applicants' claim 22 limitation of "applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema" in further combination with Applicants' claims limitation of creating several layers of core attributes / product information.

Claims 20 and 21 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 1 limitation of "defining at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema for the product information to reside," in further combination with Applicants' claims limitation of wherein storing includes using a computer readable software language / extended markup language "(XML").

Claims 69, and 70 Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Walker further in view of XML

The Office at 16 states:

16. As to claims 69-70 Walker teaches
 - a. Gathering production information from multiple establishments describing the product (C. 3 l. 19-26)
 - b. Removing the brand name (C. 7 l. 45-56)
 - c. Creating a database with only the core production information (Fig. 9a & 9b).
 - d. providing access to the information (C. 4 l. 18-19) (fig. 10a).

However, Walker fails to teach XML being used for identifying the information. XML teaches using XML language with Oracle and Microsoft databases. (Pg. 2 para D and F). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine XML with the Oracle database used by Walker to simplify the gathering of products from various establishments. This simplification removes the requirement for all establishments to maintain their databases using a common language. This allows product information to be extracted from the establishments databases regardless of how it is maintained in the home databases.
(Emphases added.)

Applicants' claims 69 and 70 recite:

69. A computer readable medium containing executable instructions which, when executed in a processing system, causes the system to:

gather product information from a plurality of establishments, the product information using the establishment's brand-specific attributes to describe a product's core traits; extract the core traits from the product information by applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema wherein the at least one XML schema identifies the core traits of the source specific product information, removes any inconsistencies in the product information, and structures the core traits into categories ; creates a consistent generic XML database of core traits; and provides access to the core product information.

70. A system for managing business information in a computer network comprising:

at least one client processor operating a client browser coupled among at least one server system and a generic consistent XML (Extensible Markup Language) database, wherein the server system gathers business data from a plurality of sources and wherein the database resides independent of the server system or the client processors;

at least one XML schema, wherein the at least one schema identifies the core information from the business data and stores the core information extracted from the business data in XML in the generic consistent XML database; and

output templates, wherein the output templates identify core information based on the at least one XML schema to be accessed from the generic consistent XML database and disseminated by a plurality of mediums.

The Office states "However, Walker fails to teach XML being used for identifying the information. XML teaches using XML language with Oracle and Microsoft databases. (Pg. 2 para D and F)."

(Emphasis added.)

XML page 2 paragraph D states:

The other big effort is that of ①Microsoft's BizTalk architecture. BizTalk may also be an ace-in-the-hole for ①Microsoft to overcome its antitrust problems as well, because it serves to open Windows to competitors. BizTalk acts to integrate applications using XML standards applied to a message passing protocol. This protocol removes requirements for homogeneous databases. languages, network protocols, object models, and especially operating systems. Needless to say, BizTalk will play a key role in the Windows DNA 2000 architecture, and the BizTalk server will coordinate communications among B2B users in this structure.

(Emphases added.)

Applicants submit that the cited reference deals with a message passing protocol NOT with XML use in databases. In fact, as stated, this message passing protocol removes requirements for homogeneous databases.

Applicants submit that this message passing protocol does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed elements of:

extract ... applying at least one XML (Extensible Markup Language) schema wherein the at least one XML schema identifies ...;

creates a consistent generic XML database of ...;

as claimed in Claim 69.

Additionally, Applicants submit that this message passing protocol does not disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed elements of:

... and a generic consistent XML (Extensible Markup Language) database...;

at least one XML schema, wherein the at least one schema ...stores the core information ...

in XML in the generic consistent XML database; and

... at least one XML schema to be accessed from the generic consistent XML database ...

as claimed in Claim 70.

XML page 2 paragraph F states:

① Oracle, for example, has introduced its XML Developer's Kit, which is based on the company's Extensible Style Language and XML parser. These components will be provided in the upcoming version of the Oracelli application suite.

(Emphases added.)

Applicants submit that the cited reference deals with a XML Developer's Kit. The cited reference does NOT detail the use of XML in databases. A developer's kit does not imply the use of XML in a database. For example, a XML developer's kit may be used to parse XML and then place the results in a hierarchical database. This does not mean that the database has XML instances of schema as Applicants have claimed.

Applicants submit that Walker and further in view of XML do not disclose limitations Applicants have claimed and therefore are non-obvious with respect to the cited references. Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of claims 69 and 70 and all claims dependent on these claims.

Claim 71 – Walker and further in view of XML fail to disclose Applicants' claim 70 limitation of "at least one XML schema, wherein the at least one schema identifies the core information from the business data and stores the core information extracted from the business data in XML in the generic consistent XML database," in further combination with Applicants' claim limitation of "wherein the generic consistent XML database resides within the server system."

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that any claim not directly discussed is addressed via the independent claim discussion on which it is dependent.

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, and requests allowance of all claims.

The Examiner is invited to call Alan Heimlich at 408 253-3860 if there remains any issue with allowance. Cleartext email communication is authorized.

Respectfully submitted,

Heimlich Law

10/05/2006



Digitally signed by Alan
Heimlich
DN: CN = Alan Heimlich,
C = US, O = Heimlich Law

Date

Alan Heimlich / Reg 48808

Customer No. 40418

Attorney for Applicant(s)

5952 Dial Way
San Jose, CA 95129

Tel: 408 253-3860
Em: alanheimlich@heimlichlaw.com